



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,443	10/27/2000	Sherif Safwat	2146	8623
7590	08/30/2006		EXAMINER	
Donald E Schreiber Donald E Schreiber A Professional Corporation Post Office Box 2926 Kings Beach, CA 96143-2926			ROWAN, KURT C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3643	

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09/674443

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

20060824

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

In response to the remand from the BPAI of 8/23/05, attached is a revised Examiner's Answer from the undersigned. The only change from the Examiner's Answer of 12/20/05 is the names of the appeal conferees and their initials. No response by appellant(s) is necessary. The application is being forwarded to the BPAI for docketing and decision.

Kurt Rowan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3643



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

AUG 30 2006

GROUP 3600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/674,443

Filing Date: October 27, 2000

Appellant(s): SAFWAT, SHERIF

Donald Schreiber
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed August 9, 2004.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-3, 12-15, 24, 26, and 40-41 stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 4-11, 16, 25, 42-47 stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 22-24, and 37-39 stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 17-22 and 27-36 stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) *ClaimsAppealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

4715142	RICHARD	12/1987
4970808	MASSIE	11/1990
5697182	RODGERS	12/1997

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-3, 12-15, 24, 26, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Richard. This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on July 1, 2003.

Claims 4-11, 16, 25, and 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Richard in view of Barfield. This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on July 1, 2003.

Claims 22-24, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Massie. This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on July 1, 2003 .

Claims 17-22 and 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Rodgers. This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on July 1, 2003.

(11) Response to Argument

Applicant argues that Richard does not disclose an electret. This is correct. However, Richard shows a biosimulating fish hook having a shank, an eye and a bend with a point terminating on the shank. Richard shows a self contained bioelectric simulating means having a anodic segment and a cathodic segment with a plastic band as shown in Fig. 2b. The definition of an electret is a solid dielectric that exhibits persistent dielectric polarization. In Richard with the anodic segment and the cathodic segment being separated by dielectric 7, a persistent dielectric polarization occurs since an electric field is set up between the anodic segment and cathodic segment with the plastic in- between.

Hence it would have been obvious to provide Richard with a known electret since merely replacing one biosimulator for another would have been obvious since the function is the same. In regard to the Massie patent which shows all of the limitations of Claim 22 with the exception of the electret. Massie is not cited to show an electret, but using an electric field to attract fish. In Rodgers, applicant argues that the electrodes do not protrude from the body and that the examiner stated that they do protrude. The specification states that they do not protrude, but clearly they are exposed to water. The sections such as probes 29, 31 connected by leads 33, 35 has an electric field between them as stated in column 2, lines 39-58 are also exposed to water and appear to protrude from the body to form an electric field to attract fish. As to the prior art suggesting the modifications, See In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 which states the test is not only what the reference suggest but rather the combination of the disclosures

with the knowledge that was readily available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Also, it is not seen that the proposed modification of Richard would cause Richard to be inoperative for its intended purpose which is catching fish. The fish hook of Richard will still corrode and break after exposure to water since the addition of an electret would not preclude the use of two dissimilar metals on other parts of the hook shank to have the same effect of corroding rapidly in water. For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurt Rowan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3643

KR
August 1, 2006

Conferees

Darren Ark 
Peter Poos


Donald E Schreiber
Donald E Schreiber A Professional Corporation
Post Office Box 2926
Kings Beach, CA 96143-2926